



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The press is inclined to attribute this to the fact that the government is being managed by men of the South. I cannot see, however, why men of the South cannot run the government, provided the country desires that they do so, and provided their rule is characterized by justice and good judgment. The fact of the matter is, however, that our internal affairs, especially with reference to the Negro, is fast reaching an acute stage, while our foreign affairs in many respects have won the contempt of other nations.

If, therefore, the influence of the South is responsible in a large measure for our woes at home and abroad, all loyal citizens should use such legitimate means as are in their power to curb this influence. In view of these considerations, the writer would like to know whether or not Colonel Harvey would consider the enforcing of Section 2 of Article I.—*i. e.*, the cutting down of Southern representation—as a means of bettering the situation. As a result of the step, the writer would like to inquire also in what way the status of the Negro citizen might be affected. The disparagement between the number of voters who elect a Congressman in the South and in the North is already very large, and a standing injustice to voters in the North.

Please let me know at your convenience what your opinion would be in the matter. I am writing you because I have been a reader of *Harper's Weekly* and of *THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW* for a number of years and consider your judgment on matters of national policy unusually sound.

CHAS. S. DUKE.

AGAINST CLASS LEGISLATION

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

SIR,—Your editorials are always interesting even when one cannot agree with you.

In the case of "Equality Before the Law," permit me to congratulate you on the stand you take.

I remember very well the editorial in *Harper's Weekly* when you addressed the President on this subject before.

I wish every editor in the country not only could read "Equality Before the Law," but were free to act on what he thinks as a man instead of being compelled to follow the policy of his paper, which too frequently is adopted for ulterior motives.

H. H. RICE.

REMINISCENT

NEW YORK CITY.

SIR,—Permit me, a stranger, to say that I experienced more pleasure in the perusal of your address to Colonel Roosevelt than ever a small boy got out of the circus. It is delicious reading!

JAMES SHARON MACCOY.

THE TREATY-MAKING POWER

LEXINGTON, VIRGINIA.

SIR,—Since *THE REVIEW* was unable to allot me space to answer Professor Corwin's article on the treaty-making power in the June num-

ber, 1914, in reply to my article on the same subject in the April number of THE REVIEW, I am very grateful to you for the privilege of at least a few words in reply thereto in the form of a note.

In a note to my original article I say:

"The limits of this paper do not permit the discussion and analysis of cases decided by the Supreme Court of the United States from *Ware v. Hylton*, 3 Dallas, 199, to *Geofroy v. Riggs*, 133 U. S., 258, which are claimed to be opposed to the views expressed above. It is confidently asserted that no case has been decided by the Supreme Court involving the direct question herein discussed."

My confidence in this statement is not abated by Professor Corwin's statement that it is "plainly without merit"; and into another forum more suited to this discussion I cordially invite him.

Ware v. Hylton has been cited for one hundred and twenty years, but rarely quoted, for the proposition that a treaty can repeal or override a law of a State. I am satisfied that it can be demonstrated to any unprejudiced legal mind that the case not only did not decide that question, *but that under the pleadings in the case it could not have decided it.*

But I submit that Professor Corwin, with a frankness which is not common to those of his school in discussing this subject, has let the cat out of the bag when he says: "On . . . the relations of the treaty-making power to the reserved rights of the States, our conclusion must be that the latter do not limit the former to any extent; that, in other words, *the United States has exactly the same range of power in making treaties as it would have if the States did not exist.*" (Italics his.) In other words, to prove his proposition that the treaty-making power is supreme over all State powers, with one stroke of the pen he abolishes the States with their powers, and then triumphantly acclaims the supremacy of the treaty-making power over the annihilated States. The victory of one party to a controversy over the other may always easily be attained by the abolition or destruction of the opposing party.

This statement is indeed of surpassing interest, for he recognizes in my article "the spread of the dissolving theories of the 'Great Nullifier.'" He is shocked at my attempted nullification of a Federal power, but suggests *the annihilation* of the States, without which the Federal power could not exist. I commend to him the words of *Macbeth*:

"We but teach

Bloody instructions, which, being taught, return
To plague the inventor! this even-handed justice
Commends the ingredients of our poison'd chalice
To our own lips—"

HENRY ST. GEORGE TUCKER.

PROFESSOR USHER'S VIEWS

DENVER, COLORADO.

SIR,—I want to call attention to what I think is a vital error into which Professor Usher has fallen in his very readable article, "The Real Mexican Problem," in the July NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

Professor Usher seems to conclude that as it was covetousness that led to the taking of the North American Indian's land away from him by the